

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ORANGEBURG DIVISION

| | | |
|------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| CODY QUINCY JONES, |) | |
| |) | |
| Petitioner, |) | |
| |) | |
| vs. |) | Case No. 5:14-cv-01199-TLW |
| |) | |
| A. MANSUKHANI, Warden, |) | |
| |) | |
| Respondent. |) | |
| |) | |
| _____ |) | |

ORDER

Petitioner Cody Quincy Jones, an inmate at Federal Correctional Institution Danbury in Danbury, Connecticut, filed this pro se habeas petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 on April 1, 2014. Respondent filed a motion to dismiss or, in the alternative, for summary judgment on June 6, 2014. (Doc. #18). Petitioner filed a response in opposition on August 25, 2014 (Doc. #25), to which Respondent did not file a reply. This matter is now before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West, to whom this case was assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(c), (D.S.C.). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this Court grant Respondent’s motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #27). Petitioner’s objections to the Report were due by December 4, 2014. Petitioner filed no objections, and this matter is now ripe for review.

The Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained therein. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections

to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, "a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

In light of this standard, the Court has carefully reviewed the Report and concludes that it accurately summarizes the case and the applicable law. Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. #27). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, Respondent's motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED**. (Doc. #18).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
Terry L. Wooten
Chief United States District Judge

January 5, 2015
Columbia, South Carolina